UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/589,849	08/23/2007	Leon-Etienne Parent	6013-147US-1	3766	
20988 OGILVY RENA	7590 03/19/200 AULT LLP	EXAMINER			
1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE			LANGEL, WAYNE A		
SUITE 1600 MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CANADA				1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/19/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commons	10/589,849	PARENT ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Wayne Langel	1793			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	-· action is non-final.				
<i>,</i> —	, -				
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
		3 G. 3 . 2 . 3.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 17 August 2006 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8-23-07. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1793

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Varshovi. No distinction is seen between the organic-based fertilizer disclosed by Varshovi, and that recited in applicants' claims Varshovi discloses a fertilizer formed by incorporating liquid nutrients into organic based materials. (See especially col. 4, line 4 to col. 6, line 32.) The various treatment methods recited in claim 1 would not necessarily result in the fertizer composition having properties distinguishable from Varshovi.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Marchese. No distinction is seen

Application/Control Number: 10/589,849

Art Unit: 1793

between the fertilizer composition disclosed by Marchese, and that recited in claims 1-7. Marchese discloses a fertilizer formed by deodorizing porcine extrement by the nitrification/denitrification technique, followed by adding to this extrement a solution.of phosphorus pentoxide and potassium oxide. (See col. 1, line 7 to col. 2, line 63.) The

Page 3

the reference discloses at col. 1, lines 33-39 that the fertilizer is balanced as to nitrogen,

fertilizer of Marchese would inherently contain 10% to 60% of a mineral fertilizer, since

phosphorus and potassium.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Varshovi in view of Marchese Varshovi discloses a fertilizer formed by incorporating liquid nutrients into organic based materials. (See especially col. 4, line 4 to col. 6, line 32.) The difference between the fertilizer disclosed by Varshovi, and that recited in applicants' claims, is that applicants' claims require a treatment of the pig manure prior to incorporation of the fertilizer. Marchese discloses a fertilizer formed by deodorizing porcine extrement by the nitrification/denitrification technique, followed by adding to this extrement a solution of phosphorus pentoxide and potassium oxide. (See col. 1, line 7 to col. 2, line 63.) It would be obvious from Marchese to subject the organic-based material of Varshovi to a nitrification/denitrification treatment prior to incorporation of the likquid nutrients. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so, since it is apparent from col. 1, lines 19-21 of Marchese that the fertilizer should be free of odor before it can be spread on fields.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1793

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "prior incorporation" is ungrammatical and therefor indefinite.

The other references are made of record for disclosing organic-based fertilizers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Langel whose telephone number is 571-272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8 am - 3:30 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/589,849

Art Unit: 1793

/Wayne Langel/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793

Page 5